

Environmental Checklist Form

1. Project title: Market Squid Fisheries Management Plan
2. Lead agency name and address:
California Fish and Game Commission
1419 Ninth Street, Room 1320
Sacramento, CA 95814
3. Contact person and phone number: Annette Henry (858) 546-5680
4. Project location: statewide marine waters
5. Project sponsor's name and address:
California Department of Fish and Game
8604 La Jolla Shores Drive
La Jolla, CA 92037
6. General plan designation: NA 7. Zoning: NA
8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)
The California Marine Life Management Act provides that fishery management plans shall form the primary basis for managing the State's marine fisheries. This plan describes the management goals, objectives, and processes for achieving a sustainable market squid fishery (*Loligo opalescens*).
9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:
highly urbanized cities such as areas near the Port of Los Angeles (San Pedro and Terminal Island)
moderately dense urban areas such as Monterey, Santa Barbara, Ventura, Port Hueneme, Moss Landing
preserved open space including State parks and National Sanctuaries
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)
None

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

x	Aesthetics		Agriculture Resources		Air Quality
x	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Geology /Soils
	Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology / Water Quality		Land Use / Planning
	Mineral Resources		Noise		Population / Housing
	Public Services		Recreation		Transportation/Traffic
	Utilities / Service Systems	x	Mandatory Findings of Significance		

DETERMINATION: On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

- x I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

14 December 2001

Date

Annette E. Henry

Printed Name

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, Earlier Analyses, may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	X			
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	X			
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	X			
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				X

III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X	
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	X			
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	X			
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	X			
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?				X
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				X
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				X
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv) Landslides?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				X
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				X
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				X
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X	
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X	
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				X
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				X
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			X	
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X	
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X
X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X
XI. NOISE – Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				X
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				X
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		X		

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X	
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?				X
Police protection?				X
Schools?				X
Parks?				X
Other public facilities?				X

XIV. RECREATION --

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				X
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				X
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?			X	
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE --

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	X			
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	X			
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	

I. Aesthetics

- a) Potentially Significant Impact - Fishery Management Plans have the potential to close specific areas to fishing as a management tool. This could result in fishing vessels concentrating in smaller areas and the addition or removal of fishing vessels will change scenic vistas from the existing views.
- b) No Impact - The project will occur in the marine nearshore and offshore environment, not on land.
- c) Potentially Significant Impact - same as a
- d) Potentially Significant Impact - The market squid fishery occurs during nighttime hours. Typically, it is a two-boat operation with one vessel (a light boat) using bright lights to attract squid while the other (seiner) hauls in the catch. The lights associated with the fishery can be up to 30,000 watts and are shielded.

II. Agricultural Resources

- a) No Impact - The project occurs in marine nearshore and offshore environments not on land.
- b) No Impact - same as a
- c) No Impact - same as a

III. Air Quality

- a) Less Than Significant Impact - Air emissions from squid fishing vessels could be concentrated in areas due to changes in open fishing areas.
- b) Less Than Significant Impact - same as a
- c) Less Than Significant Impact - same as a
- d) Less Than Significant Impact - same as a
- e) No Impact - Squid fishing activities will not occur in the vicinity of a substantial number of people.

IV. Biological Resources

- a) Potentially Significant Impact - The squid fishery operates in sandy bottom areas that are relatively shallow (< 100 m) and quite often close to sensitive marine and coastal bird habitats. Adult listed species could be lost due to entanglement with fishing gear. There is concern that light activity at night from squid fishing vessels is related to a lower productivity rate for seabirds. Some of the seabirds using these islands for breeding include the California Brown Pelican (State Status: Endangered, 1971; Fully Protected; Federal Status: Endangered, 1970), Xantus's Murrelet (State Status: Species of Special Concern, Federal Status: none) and the Ashy-storm Petrel (State Status: Species of Special Concern, Federal Status: none). Bright lights from squid fishing vessels may also disorient birds causing them to collide with vessels and separate chicks and parents in the water. Finally, night light activity from squid vessels may increase predation on seabirds by owls and gulls.
- b) Potentially Significant Impact - Fishery Management Plans have the potential to close specific areas to fishing as a management tool. This could result in fishing vessels concentrating in smaller areas which have the potential to be close to sensitive marine and coastal bird habitats. Increased fishing pressure in the remaining open areas could result in the degradation of habitat and abandonment of fishing gear. The physical damage to habitats could be concentrated in sensitive habitats if these were the remaining fishing areas open.
- c) No Impact - Fishing activities do not occur in wetlands including salt marshes.
- d) Potentially Significant Impact - Increased noise around bird rookeries has the potential to disturb parent birds resulting in egg and/or juvenile loss due to falling or predation during parent absences.

- e) No Impact - The Market Squid Fishery Management Plan will be consistent with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.
- f) No Impact - The Market Squid Fishery Management Plan will be consistent with provisions of adopted habitat conservation plans.

V. Cultural Resources

- a) No Impact - No historical resource will be affected.
- b) Less Than Significant Impact - Incidental and/or accidental interaction with a shipwreck has a remote potential to occur. Known shipwrecks are marked on nautical charts and fishing vessels make every effort to avoid these areas.
- c) No Impact - No unique resource, site, or feature is known to occur in the nearshore area.
- d) No Impact - No human remains will be affected.

VI. Geology and Soils

- a) i) - iv) No Impact - Squid fishing activities are not susceptible to land based geological movements.
- b) No Impact - Squid fishing activities do not result in soil erosion nor loss of top soil.
- c) No Impact - Squid fishing activities occur on water not on land.
- d) No Impact - same as c
- e) No Impact - same as c

VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- a) No Impact - Squid fishing vessels do not transport nor dispose of hazardous materials.
- b) Less Than Significant Impact - Squid fishing vessel sinking, grounding and capsizing occasionally occur, however, these are avoided to the maximum extent possible.
- c) Less Than Significant Impact - Squid fishing vessels have the potential to sink, ground, or capsize in the vicinity of schools located adjacent to the shoreline.
- d) No Impact - Squid fishing activities occur on water not on land.
- e) No Impact - same as d
- f) No Impact - same as d
- g) No Impact - Squid fishing activities would not be authorized to occur in the vicinity of an emergency response.
- h) No Impact - Fires do not occur in the area of squid fishing activities.

VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality

- a) Less Than Significant Impact - Squid fishing activities would not violate water quality standards on a routine basis, however, could if a spill occurs. The project would not increase the frequency of spills.
- b) No Impact - Squid fishing activities occur on water not on land.
- c) No Impact - same as b
- d) No Impact - same as b
- e) Less Than Significant Impact - Discharge of squid processing water, gray water and food wastes would occur, however, the project would not increase the frequency nor volume of material discharged compared to current levels.
- f) Less Than Significant Impact - same as a
- g) No Impact - same as b

- h) No Impact - same as b
- i) No Impact - same as b
- j) No Impact - same as b

IX. Land Use and Planning

- a) No Impact - Squid fishing activities do not occur on land.
- b) No Impact - The project would not conflict with adopted local coastal plans.
- c) No Impact - The project would not conflict with applicable habitat conservation plans.

X. Mineral Resources

- a) No Impact - Squid fishing activities do not target mineral resources.
- b) No Impact - same as a

XI. Noise

- a) No Impact - The project would not expose people to noise levels in excess of established standards.
- b) No Impact - Squid fishing activities do not produce ground borne noises.
- c) No Impact - Squid fishing activities do not produce permanent stationary noise sources.
- d) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation - Marine and coastal birds could be exposed to temporary increases in noise levels due in fishing areas near bird rookeries (see Biological Resources). Studies should be conducted to determine noise levels at rookeries from typical fishing activities. To mitigate, monitoring studies should be conducted to determine which noise levels result in adverse behavioral changes.
- e) No Impact - Squid fishing activities do not occur within an airport land use designation.
- f) No Impact - Squid fishing activities do not occur within the vicinity of an airstrip.

XII. Population and Housing

- a) No Impact - The Squid Fishery Management Plan is being developed to ensure sustainability of the resource and will likely result in a smaller fleet so no population growth is anticipated during the life of the Project.
- b) No Impact - The project will not displace substantial numbers of existing housing.
- c) Less Than Significant Impact - If management options result in the loss of fishing opportunities, local communities may see a decrease in population numbers from families relocating elsewhere.

XIII. Public Services

- a) No Impact - No additional public services will be necessary due to the project.

XIV. Recreation

- a) No Impact - Squid fishing activities will not result in deterioration of recreational facilities.
- b) No Impact - No new or expansion of recreational facilities is anticipated with the project.

XV. Transportation

- a) No Impact - No increase in traffic is anticipated due to implementation of the project.
- b) No Impact - same as a
- c) No Impact - same as a

- d) No Impact - same as a
- e) No Impact - same as a
- f) Less Than Significant Impact - Changing the areas open for fishing could result in some harbor parking facilities see an increase in usage due to displacement from other areas.
- g) No Impact - The project will not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs.

XVI. Utilities and Service Systems

- a) No Impact - The project fishing activities do not affect wastewater treatment plant loadings beyond current levels.
- b) No Impact - same as a
- c) No Impact - The project fishing activities do not affect stormwater drainage facilities beyond current levels.
- d) No Impact - The project fishing activities do not affect water supplies beyond current levels.
- e) No Impact - same as a
- f) No Impact - The project fishing activities do not affect landfill capacity beyond current levels.
- g) No Impact - same as f

XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance

- a) Potentially Significant Impact - The project has the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, reduce the habitat of a wildlife species, cause a wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels and reduce the number of or restrict range of listed species.
- b) Potentially Significant Impact - The project has the potential to cumulative effect marine and coastal bird habitats and populations, coastal habitats including nursery sites, or reduce recruitment of localized fish populations.
- c) Less Than Significant Impact - While the project has to potential to displace fishing families due to loss of jobs, these are not the result of environmental effects of the project.